

U.S. Patent Application No. 09/626,699 Attorney Docket No. 9147-96559 (01-0101)
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE dated October 28, 2010 S99B4001US02
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2010

REMARKS

Claims 46-53, 56-63, and 66-72 were pending.

By virtue of this response, Claims 46, 56, and 66-69 are amended, claims 71-72 are cancelled, and claims 73-74 are newly presented.

Therefore, Claims 46-53, 56-63, 66-70 and 73-74 are presently pending.

Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented.

No new matter is added.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C § 112) of Claim 67

In point 3 of the rejection, the term 'UE' was objected to in line 8 of former claim 67. Amended Claim 67 has been corrected on this point. See particularly the antecedent basis for 'UE' now included in line 2 of Claim 67.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) of Claims 46-53, 56-63 and 66-70.

The application presently contains six independent claims, namely Claims 46, 56, 66, 67, 69 and 74.

On page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 46-50, 56-60, 66-67 and 69 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara et al. (hereinafter “Fujiwara”, US6,064,879) in view of Lipsit (hereinafter “Lipsit”, US5,956,636), and further in view of Vilander et al. (hereinafter “Vilander”, US6,618,592). The Applicants are traversing this rejection.

On page 7 of the Office Action, Claims 51-53 and 61-63 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Lipsit and Vilander, and further in view of Rai (hereinafter “Rai”, 6,675,208). The Applicants are traversing this rejection.

On page 8 of the Office Action, Claims 68 and 70 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara in view of Lipsit and Vilander, and further in view of Bertrand et al. (hereinafter “Bertrand”, 6,687,252). Applicants are traversing this rejection.

Concerning Claim 46

Claim 46 has been amended. Claim 46 provides, amongst other steps, the following steps highlighted in bold:

“A method for a registration server of a wireless network, for registering a user equipment (UE) accessing the Internet through a Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS) access network, the method comprising:

establishing an anonymous communication session between the UE and the registration server via a radio access network and a core network, in response to authentication by an authentication server of a temporary ID and a temporary password identifying the UE as unregistered, wherein the anonymous communication session uses a tunneling communications protocol;

transmitting to the UE, via the anonymous communication session with the UE, a reply message comprising a request for registration information; and

receiving, from the UE, in response to the request for registration information, a permanent ID and a permanent password”.

Fujiwara fails either to show or to suggest the steps highlighted in bold above. Considering Fujiwara in more detail:

Fujiwara relates to a mobile telephone that accesses a telephone network. See lines 18-19 in column 1 of Fujiwara. In contrast to this, the method of Claim 46 concerns “*a user*

equipment (UE) accessing the Internet through a Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS) access network.”

Registration in Fujiwara commences with a telephone call that is placed using a conventional telephone number. See lines 62-63 in column 3 of Fujiwara, to wit: *“a telephone number (DN), together with lines 38-39 in column 4 of Fujiwara ‘By dialing a designated DN....’”* In Fujiwara, the telephone number may be used both for initial registration and subsequently. See lines 54-62 in column 7 of Fujiwara. In contrast, the method of Claim 46 concerns *“establishing an anonymous communication session between the UE and the registration server.”*

Since Fujiwara does not contain the step of *“establishing an anonymous communication session between the UE and the registration server,”* then this step is clearly not carried out *“in response to authentication by an authentication server of a temporary ID and a temporary password identifying the UE as unregistered,”* as specified in Claim 46. Registration in Fujiwara involves only recognition that an “ID” of a mobile unit is a temporary ID. See lines 58-59 in column 4 of Fujiwara.

Furthermore, since Fujiwara does not contain the step of *“establishing an anonymous communication session between the UE and the registration server,”* it does not contain the step *‘wherein the anonymous communication session uses a tunneling communications protocol.’*

The arrangement of Fujiwara involves a *“central controller (CC),”* see line 42 in column 4 of Fujiwara, and a *“customer management system,”* see lines 2-3 in column 4 of Fujiwara. It appears that the central controller of Fujiwara transmits a permanent ID to the mobile unit, although the permanent ID is stored in the CAS. At registration, Fujiwara provides to the mobile unit *“one of the unused permanent IDs stored in the unused permanent ID recorder.”* See lines 35-39 in column 7, and figure 7, of Fujiwara. No password is provided, and no permanent ID is received from the mobile unit. In contrast,

Claim 46 includes "*receiving, from the UE, in response to the request for registration information, a permanent ID and a permanent password.*"

It is also important to note that Claim 46 specifies, with underlining emphasis added "*establishing an anonymous communication session between the UE and the registration server via a radio access network and a core network, in response to authentication by an authentication server.*" Step 5 in figure 2 of the application provides more detail of communication between the UE and the authentication server, see also server 34 shown in figure 1 of the application. Lines 21-23 on page 6 of the application provide more detail of the communication to the registration server, see also server 36 shown in figure 1 of the application. In Fujiwara, communication occurs between the mobile unit 12 and central controller CC, with the controller forwarding information from other elements of the system, see figure 3 of Fujiwara.

Lipsit does not disclose steps that correspond to those steps of Claim 46 that are not shown by Fujiwara.

Lipsit describes an arrangement whereby a set of permanent details are already stored in a wireless device, prior to it being delivered to a customer. See lines 13-30 in column 3 of Lipsit. See also lines 51-56 of column 3 of Lipsit "*Each wireless device 30 is fully programmed with, in the case of a cellular phone, all the NAM parameters or...their functional equivalent, so that, when the wireless device is sent to the recipient...no further programming of the wireless device 30 is required.*"

The rejection cites lines 13-54 in column 9 of Lipsit. However, the steps in column 9 of Lipsit apply to the situation where the wireless device supplier has not supplied some data to the service provider. Even when the user has entered sufficient information to cause activation of a record of the wireless device at the service provider, no change of data within the wireless device is made. The sections of column 3 cited in the rejection make clear that it is not necessary to change any of the data in the wireless device, since the

U.S. Patent Application No. 09/626,699 Attorney Docket No. 9147-96559 (01-0101)
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE dated October 28, 2010 S99B4001US02
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2010

wireless device has the necessary permanent information within it, all along. This permanent information was preloaded by the device supplier, and clearly is therefore in the wireless device prior to the recipient first dialing the activation unit.

Vilander does not supplant such deficiencies. The passages of Vilander that are cited in the rejection do not go beyond mentioning the existence of Point-to-Point and Layer 2 Tunneling protocols, and pointing out the disadvantage caused by the delay that they may cause. See lines 18-19 in column 2 of Vilander.

In the light of the above, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claim 46.

Concerning Claims 56, 66, 67 and 69

Claims 56, 66, 67 and 69 contain steps and features that correspond to those in Claim 46. For analogous reasons to those given above in relation to Claim 46, therefore, Claims 56, 66, 67 and 69 are distinguished over the teachings of Fujiwara, Lipsit and Vilander.

In the light of this, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 56, 66, 67 and 69.

Concerning Claim 74

Newly present independent Claim 74 relates to a User Equipment that is configured and arranged to carry out registration with a registration server of a wireless network. The User Equipment of the present application is shown, for example, as units 21 and 22 in figure 1.

The features of Claim 74 correspond to the method steps of Claim 56. Claim 74 is therefore distinguished over the teachings of Fujiwara, Lipsit and Vilander, for the reasons given above with regard to Claim 56.

U.S. Patent Application No. 09/626,699 Attorney Docket No. 9147-96559 (01-0101)
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE dated October 28, 2010 S99B4001US02
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2010

The applicant therefore respectfully requests allowance of Claim 74.

Concerning Claims 47-53, 57-63, 68, 70 and 73

Each of Claims 47-53, 57-63, 68, 70 and 73 is dependent on one of Claims 46, 56, 66, 67 or 69. For at least this reason, each of Claims 47-53, 57-63, 68, 70 and 73 is therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

The case is believed to be in condition for allowance and notice to such effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any other points of concern, the Examiner is expressly invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to discuss those concerns and to seek an amicable resolution.

Respectfully submitted,
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

Dated: October 28, 2010


Steven G. Parmelee
Registration No. 28,790

120 South LaSalle Street, Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406
Telephone (312) 577-7000
Facsimile (312) 577-7007